

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1-3 are amended, and claims 7-14 are added. No new matter is added. Support for the added features is provided in at least Fig. 6, and specification page 18, line 14-23, page 23, line 21 – page 24, line 6. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Zanelli in the January 10, 2005 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Specification Objection

The Office Action objects to the specification because of an informality. Specifically, the Office Action requests clarification of the term "gazette 1" disclosed in the present specification on page 2, line 14. The specification is amended to correct the informality. No new matter is added. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claims 2 and 3 because of informalities. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the number of control units recited in claims 2 and 3 is unclear. For the purpose of clarification, claims 2 and 3 are amended to delete the modifiers "third" and "fourth." Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 3 are not narrowed by such amendments. The navigation apparatus recited in each claim is not limited to a single display control unit. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that "the second selection unit" recited in claim 3 lacks antecedent basis. Claims 4-6 are rejected solely on their dependency from claim 3. Claim 3 is amended to correctly recite that the point is selected by "the first selection

unit" to obviate the rejection. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejects claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,199,014 to Walker et al. ("Walker") or U.S. Patent No. 6,182,010 to Berstis ("Berstis"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

During the January 10 personal interview, Examiner Zanelli agreed that neither Walker nor Berstis teaches or suggests a navigation apparatus in which "the real image includes at least one of an aerial photograph and a satellite photograph," as recited in claim 3. However, Examiner Zanelli indicated that an updated search would be needed to determine allowability.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is patentable over Walker and Berstis. Claims 4-6 depend from claim 3, and thus also are patentable over Walker and Berstis at least for the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on Walker and Berstis are respectfully requested.

V. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0177944 to Ihara et al. ("Ihara"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

During the January 10 personal interview, Examiner Zanelli also agreed that Ihara does not teach or suggest a navigation apparatus in which "the real image includes at least one of an aerial photograph and a satellite photograph," as recited in claims 1-3. However, Examiner Zanelli indicated that an updated search would be needed to determine allowability.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3 are patentable over Ihara.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Holly N. Moore
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:HNM/kzb

Date: January 12, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461